ATTACHMENT 13

William M. Seifert - Highly Confidential June 29, 2016

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	NORTHER DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN JOSE DIVISION
4	CT CCO CYCERDMO TNC
5	CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,
6	Plaintiff,
7	vs. Civil Action No. 5:14-cv-5344-BLF
8	ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.,
9	Defendants.
10	
11	HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
12	SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
13	
14	VIDEO RECORDED DEPOSITION OF EXPERT WILLIAM M. SEIFERT
15	JUNE 29, 2016
16	9:51 A.M.
17	
18	50 California Street, 21st Floor
19	San Francisco, California
20	3.
21	
22	REPORTED BY:
23	Mark W. Banta
24	CSR No. 6034, CRR
25	

10:10:27	1	A. Right.
	2	Q. Which it sells in conjunction with, for example,
	3	its routers and switches.
	4	A. Yes.
10:10:33	5	Q. Okay. You understand that one of those
	6	operating systems is what Cisco refers to as IOS?
	7	A. Yes.
	8	Q. You understand that IOS has a command line
	9	interface within it?
10:10:42	10	A. Yes.
	11	Q. Okay. And do you agree that we can refer to
	12	that command line interface as a CLI?
	13	A. Yes.
	14	Q. Okay. Can you describe for me your awareness of
10:10:56	15	any aspect of Cisco's CLI other than what it is alleging
	16	Arista has copied?
	17	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague. Overbroad.
	18	THE WITNESS: Again, I'm not sure what you're
	19	referring to in terms of what does the question mean.
10:11:13	20	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	21	Q. Have you ever used Cisco IOS?
	22	A. Yes.
	23	Q. And you've interacted with the CLI for Cisco,
	24	one or more versions of Cisco's IOS?
10:11:27	25	A. Yes.

10:11:27	1	Q. For example, you've input commands?
	2	A. Yes.
	3	Q. Okay. You understand that in this lawsuit Cisco
	4	alleges that Arista copied over 400 multi-word command
10:11:37	5	expressions?
	6	A. Yes.
	7	Q. You understand that there are more than just
	8	those 500-plus command expressions that are a part of
	9	Cisco's CLI?
10:11:46	10	A. Yes.
	11	Q. Okay. Can you name for me any commands that
	12	you're aware of in Cisco's CLI that Cisco's not alleging
	13	Arista copied?
	14	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague.
10:12:01	15	THE WITNESS: Well, I think in fact I wasn't
	16	really asked to produce that in my report, so, no, I
	17	don't think I can actually name something that was not
	18	mentioned in the complaint.
	19	BY MR. NEUKOM:
10:12:13	20	Q. Okay. Did you use Cisco IOS for purposes of
	21	preparing your report?
	22	A. No.
	23	Q. When's the last time you've used Cisco any
	24	version of Cisco's IOS?
10:12:28	25	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague.

10:13:41	1	A. In part. What is publicly available, yes.
	2	Q. Okay. But you haven't actually sat at a
	3	computer or a terminal and used Cisco's IOS software, for
	4	example, to configure or manage a network in I take it as
10:14:00	5	least three years' time?
	6	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Asked and answered.
	7	THE WITNESS: No, I have not.
	8	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	9	Q. Okay. Other than reviewing Cisco's complaint
10:14:11	10	and reviewing a handful of CCIE training materials, what
	11	steps did you take to familiarize or refamiliarize
	12	yourself with Cisco's CLI for purposes of this report?
	13	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague.
	14	THE WITNESS: Well, I, of course, referred to
10:14:31	15	Cisco's or accessed Cisco's website, online manuals,
	16	printed manuals where they existed, some historical, some
	17	current.
	18	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	19	Q. And in the course of reviewing, for example,
10:14:49	20	materials available on Cisco's website, were you able to
	21	identify any aspects of Cisco's CLI that it has not
	22	alleged Arista has copied?
	23	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Asked and answered
	24	and vague.
10:15:01	25	THE WITNESS: Again, outside the scope of my

10:24:25	1	proposed?
	2	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Asked and answered
	3	and vague.
	4	THE WITNESS: No.
10:24:32	5	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	6	Q. So for purposes of preparing your expert report
	7	which covers, among other issues, a de facto industry
	8	standard, you formulated anew this understanding of a
	9	de facto industry standard?
10:24:48	10	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Mischaracterizes
	11	prior testimony.
	12	THE WITNESS: I don't agree that it's a new
	13	definition. This is simply my my words based on my
	14	experience, my involvement with three startup companies
10:25:05	15	that were in fact network equipment manufacturers, and
	16	numerous interaction with customers over 30 years of
	17	experience in this industry.
	18	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	19	Q. Before your involvement in this case, had you
10:25:20		
	20	ever shared with anyone this understanding of a de facto
	21	industry standard?
	21	industry standard?
	21 22	industry standard? MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague.
	21 22 23	<pre>industry standard? MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague. THE WITNESS: I I can't remember if I did or</pre>

11:09:02	1	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	2	Q. Okay.
	3	A. So when I say a network device being able to
	4	communicate to another, one to another, I'm speaking of
11:09:10	5	the end systems communicating one to the other.
	6	Q. Got it. In paragraph 21 you discussed your
	7	participation in a working group at the IETF?
	8	A. Yes.
	9	Q. And the working group that you participated in
11:09:34	10	was called the "Benchmark Working Group." Do I have that
	11	right?
	12	A. Yes.
	13	Q. Was there was it the purpose of that working
	14	group to propose or explore a common command line
11:09:51	15	interface for the networking industry?
	16	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague.
	17	THE WITNESS: No.
	18	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	19	Q. If you turn to paragraph 33, it's on page 11, if
11:10:34	20	that helps. Are you with me?
	21	A. Yes.
Tr.	22	Q. Okay. In paragraph 33 you write:
	23	"An industry standard prescribes a set of
	24	product characteristics that are widely adopted
11:10:51	25	by either all or a significant portion of a

11:18:41	1	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	2	Q. And when you refer to Cisco's implementation of
	3	a CLI, which implementation or implementations do you
	4	have in mind?
11:18:48	5	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
	6	Overbroad.
	7	THE WITNESS: Again, I can't point to the
	8	version number or even the year, but at some point in the
	9	'90s I would say, in my opinion, is when the Cisco
11:19:06	10	generic CLI was in fact adopted by other vendors as a
	11	de facto standard.
	12	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	13	Q. When you refer to "the Cisco generic CLI," can
	14	you explain to me what you mean by that?
11:19:25	15	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague.
i	16	THE WITNESS: Well, just as I said a minute ago,
	17	that the generic CLI meaning their command line interface
	18	as it existed at any given point in time without
	19	referring to a specific version or release number.
11:19:42	20	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	21	Q. Okay. So to put it mildly, you have opined that
	22	the 500-plus multi-word command expressions that Cisco is
	23	asserting against Arista for copyright infringement, that
	24	at some point in the past those have become a de facto
11:20:03	25	industry standard? Do you agree with that statement?
	- 1	

11:25:43	1	A. Yes.
	2	Q. When you wrote "the identified CLI commands,"
	3	you're referring to the 500 plus multi-word command
	4	expressions that Cisco has asserted against Arista for
11:25:55	5	copyright infringement?
	6	A. Again, not putting a number on it, no.
	7	Q. Have you formed an opinion one way or another
	8	about whether the identified CLI commands have become
	9	de facto industry standard commands?
11:26:16	10	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Asked and answered.
	11	Vague. Overbroad.
	12	THE WITNESS: So let me say this one more time.
	13	To the extent that other vendors have implemented similar
	14	or potentially identical commands, keyword, actions,
11:26:37	15	responses to Cisco's, I refer to that as an industry
	16	standard CLI, yes.
	17	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	18	Q. And is it in fact your opinion that the
	19	"identified CLI commands" as we sit here today, that they
11:26:54	20	have in fact become de facto industry standard commands?
	21	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Asked and answered.
	22	I'm not sure how many times you're going to ask the same
	22 23	I'm not sure how many times you're going to ask the same question, but it's been a number of times at this point.
	V (min min min min min min min min min min	
11:27:06	23	question, but it's been a number of times at this point.

11:27:07	1	MS. McCLOSKEY: I think he's responded numerous
	2	times. Asked and answered. Vague. Ambiguous.
	3	THE WITNESS: I same answer. I'm going to
	4	just say that to the extent other vendors have
11:27:21	5	implemented the same or similar keywords to Cisco's,
	6	that, to me, is the definition of an industry standard
	7	CLI, yes.
	8	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	9	Q. So that's the process pursuant to which you
11:27:31	10	would go about forming an opinion about whether any
	11	particular command expression had become a de facto
	12	industry standard command. Am I hearing you right?
	13	A. No, I don't think that's the process.
	14	Q. Have you made a determination for any one of the
11:27:48	15	500-plus command expressions at issue in this case that
	16	they have in fact been adopted by a sufficient number of
	17	other vendors in the marketplace to become a de facto
	18	industry standard?
	19	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Asked and answered.
11:28:03	20	Vague. Ambiguous.
	21	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure that I understand
	22	that question. Say that again? Have I an opinion?
	23	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	24	Q. Yeah. Have you formed an opinion?
11:28:14	25	MS. McCLOSKEY: Same objections.

11:28:15	1	THE WITNESS: Yes.
	2	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	3	Q. And for which of the identified CLI commands
	4	have you formed an opinion that they have become at least
11:28:27	5	by the time we sit here today, that they have become a
	6	de facto industry standard?
	7	A. So, again, for purposes of this report, I wasn't
	8	asked and nor did I investigate an exact number or count
	9	how many such command word keywords that are on
11:28:44	10	that were in dispute were implemented by other vendors.
	11	I, in fact, believe there's another expert in this case
	12	who will testify to that, not me.
	13	Q. Okay. So you have not formed or disclosed an
	14	opinion that any of Cisco's asserted command expressions
11:29:02	15	are, in fact, an industry standard. Do I have that
	16	right?
	17	A. No.
	18	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.
	19	Asked and answered.
11:29:10	20	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	21	Q. Which of Cisco's command expressions that it's
	22	asserting in this case, for which of those command
	23	expressions have you formed an opinion that they are, in
	24	fact, industry standard commands?
11:29:22	25	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Asked and answered.

11:31:49	1	Ambiguous.
	2	THE WITNESS: I have not formed an opinion, no.
	3	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	4	Q. Okay. For "the command modes and prompts," that
11:31:58	5	Cisco is asserting against Arista in this case, I take it
	6	you have not yet formed or disclosed an opinion about
	7	which of those modes or prompts that Cisco's asserting
	8	against Arista, which of those modes or prompts are
	9	versus are not industry standard modes and prompts?
11:32:18	10	A. Again
	11	MS. McCLOSKEY: Object to form. Vague.
	12	Ambiguous.
	13	THE WITNESS: Again, I was not asked to identify
		ind mindel, inguin, i was need danta ee incheing
	14	which ones. There's another expert who will testify to
11:32:28		
11:32:28	14	which ones. There's another expert who will testify to
11:32:28	14	which ones. There's another expert who will testify to which ones are the same or similar, so no, this report
11:32:28	14 15 16	which ones. There's another expert who will testify to which ones are the same or similar, so no, this report does not address that.
11:32:28	14 15 16 17	which ones. There's another expert who will testify to which ones are the same or similar, so no, this report does not address that. BY MR. NEUKOM:
11:32:28 11:32:43	14 15 16 17 18	which ones. There's another expert who will testify to which ones are the same or similar, so no, this report does not address that. BY MR. NEUKOM: Q. Okay. And I take it it's also the case that you
	14 15 16 17 18 19	which ones. There's another expert who will testify to which ones are the same or similar, so no, this report does not address that. BY MR. NEUKOM: Q. Okay. And I take it it's also the case that you haven't formed an opinion or disclosed an opinion about
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	which ones. There's another expert who will testify to which ones are the same or similar, so no, this report does not address that. BY MR. NEUKOM: Q. Okay. And I take it it's also the case that you haven't formed an opinion or disclosed an opinion about which command response elements at issue in this case
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	which ones. There's another expert who will testify to which ones are the same or similar, so no, this report does not address that. BY MR. NEUKOM: Q. Okay. And I take it it's also the case that you haven't formed an opinion or disclosed an opinion about which command response elements at issue in this case MS. McCLOSKEY: Same
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	which ones. There's another expert who will testify to which ones are the same or similar, so no, this report does not address that. BY MR. NEUKOM: Q. Okay. And I take it it's also the case that you haven't formed an opinion or disclosed an opinion about which command response elements at issue in this case MS. McCLOSKEY: Same BY MR. NEUKOM:
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>which ones. There's another expert who will testify to which ones are the same or similar, so no, this report does not address that. BY MR. NEUKOM: Q. Okay. And I take it it's also the case that you haven't formed an opinion or disclosed an opinion about which command response elements at issue in this case</pre>

13:56:26	1	cover sheet that says Exhibit C.
	2	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	3	Q. Okay. If you could please turn to well, this
	4	does get confusing, doesn't it?
13:57:08	5	Please turn to there's a page which has
	6	nothing on the page except the word "Exhibit D," and the
	7	next page following that begins a large table which has
	8	the header Appendix H.BR. Do you see what I'm referring
	9	to?
13:57:25	10	A. Yes.
	11	Q. Okay. And that table that begins on the page
	12	following how do you want to refer to this? Should we
	13	call it Exhibit D?
	14	A. Sure. That's fine.
13:57:38	15	Q. Okay. Did you prepare the table that's here in
	16	Exhibit D?
	17	A. No, I did not.
	18	Q. This exhibit was provided to you by counsel?
	19	A. Yes.
13:57:51	20	Q. Did you undertake any steps to confirm the
	21	accuracy of the contents of Exhibit D?
	22	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague.
	23	THE WITNESS: Well, as I recall, I did look at
	24	Brocade's website and their user guide that's or
13:58:10	25	information available there to sort of spot-check a

13:58:13	1	couple of commands, yes. That's it.
	2	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	3	Q. Can you tell me for which of these commands you
	4	spot-checked?
13:58:20	5	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection.
	6	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	7	Q. For accuracy?
	8	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague.
	9	THE WITNESS: No, I can't really tell you which
13:58:24	10	ones. I just remember doing a few, not exhaustively.
	11	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	12	Q. Okay. Three? Five?
	13	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. The witness has
	14	already testified that he doesn't remember. He remembers
13:58:33	15	doing a few.
	16	THE WITNESS: You know, a handful. That's all I
	17	can characterize it as.
	18	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	19	Q. For the rest of them, for the contents of
13:58:43	20	Exhibit D, you trusted counsel to have collected and
	21	represented this information accurately?
	22	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague.
	23	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.
	24	BY MR. NEUKOM:
13:58:58	25	Q. Exhibit E. And again, this is a little

13:59:01	1	confusing because it looks like the first substantive
	2	page of Exhibit E has the header Appendix H.DE, but I'm
	3	willing to call it Exhibit E if you are.
	4	A. Sure.
13:59:14	5	Q. Okay.
	6	A. Fine.
	7	Q. You didn't prepare Exhibit E?
	8	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection.
	9	THE WITNESS: No.
13:59:20	10	MS. McCLOSKEY: Vague.
	11	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	12	Q. Exhibit E was prepared was provided to you by
	13	Arista's counsel in this case?
	14	A. Yes.
13:59:30	15	Q. Did you review any materials to confirm or to
	16	verify the accuracy of what's represented here in Exhibit
	17	E?
	18	MS. McCLOSKEY: Objection. Vague.
	19	THE WITNESS: I did view a Dell-supplied
13:59:47	20	You Tube video which has a side-by-side comparison of a
	21	number of configuration commands, so again, to the extent
	22	that that validates, I don't know, some number.
	23	BY MR. NEUKOM:
	24	Q. Sure.
13:59:57	25	A. 10 or fewer perhaps.

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
3	
4	I, MARK W. BANTA, a Certified Shorthand
5	Reporter, do hereby certify:
6	That prior to being examined, the witness in
7	the foregoing proceedings was by me duly affirmed to
8	testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
9	the truth;
10	That said proceedings were taken before me at
11	the time and place therein set forth and were taken down
12	by me in shorthand and thereafter transcribed into
13	typewriting under my direction and supervision;
14	I further certify that I am neither counsel
15	for, nor related to, any party to said proceedings, nor
16	in any way interested in the outcome thereof.
17	In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed
18	my name.
19	Dated: July 1, 2016
20	
21	
22	Ma Ru Santa
23	1 - Carrot
24	MARK W. BANTA
25	CSR 6034, CRR